

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended herein. Support for the amendment is found, for example, at page 15, lines 3-19.

No new matter is presented.

I. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Kishioka in view of Hitoshi

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishioka (US 2002/0098352) in view of Hitoshi et al (EP 0930322).

Without conceding the merits of the rejection, claim 1 is amended herein to recite that the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer in the touch panel side has a 180°-peeling adhesive strength (to a norbornene based resin film at a peeling rate of 300 mm/min at 23°C) of 5.5 N/20 mm or more, and the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer in the display device side has a 180°-peeling adhesive strength (to a glass plate or a triacetyl cellulose film at a peeling rate of 300 mm/min at 23°C) of not more than 5.0 N/20 mm so that the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet is repeatedly peelable from the display surface of the display device together with the touch panel.

Neither Kishioka nor Hitoshi teach or suggest the above feature of the present invention in which the adhesive strengths of both surface layers of the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet are specifically selected to enable repeat peeling of the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet from the display surface of the display device together with the touch panel. Thus, even if the references were combined, the present invention would not have been achieved. For at least this reason the present invention is not rendered obvious by Kishioka and Hitoshi.

Furthermore, although the Examiner indicates that Hitoshi teaches that “the proportion of the major component constituting each pressure-sensitive adhesive layer is 80% by weight or more based on the whole amount of the monomer components”, unlike the present invention, there is no teaching or suggestion in Hitoshi that at least two pressure-sensitive adhesive layers are constituted from the same kind of monomer and the proportion of the major component is 80% by weight or more. Especially, Hitoshi only discloses a pressure-sensitive adhesive layer of a single layer form. Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest the present invention, whether taken alone or in combination.

According to the present invention, adhesive strength between the respective pressure-sensitive adhesive layers can be improved owing to the above-mentioned constitution and, as a result, the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet is repeatedly peelable from the display surface of the display device together with the touch panel. Such a constitution and effect of the invention are not disclosed by the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

B. Minoru et al [Okabe et al] in view of Kishioka and Hitoshi

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minoru et al (Abstract of JP 07-105781) (hereinafter JP ‘781) in view of Kishioka and Hitoshi.

The Examiner admits that JP ‘781 does not disclose a double-sided adhesive tape. Kishioka and Hitoshi also fail to teach or suggest the double-sided adhesive tape of the present invention as set forth above. Specifically, none of the cited references teaches or suggest the feature of the present invention in which the adhesive strengths of both surface layers of the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet are specifically to enable repeat peeling of the

double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet from the display surface of the display device together with the touch panel.

Due to the constitution of the present invention, the adhesive strength between the respective pressure-sensitive adhesive layers can be improved as a result, the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet is repeatedly peelable from the display surface of the display device together with the touch panel. Such a constitution and effect of the invention are not disclosed by the cited references. Thus, the present invention is patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Jennifer M. Hayes
Registration No. 40,641

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 27, 2008